

REMARKS

This response is intended as a complete response to the Final Office Action dated October 12, 2007. In view of the following discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his comments regarding the allowability of claims 9, 13-16, 20, and 31 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants further thank the Examiner for his comments regarding the allowance of claims 43-50.

In response, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 23, to incorporate the limitations of claim 9 and 31, respectively. Accordingly, claims 4-9, 12, 17, and 26-31 have been cancelled. In addition, the Applicants have amended claims 13-16 to depend from independent claim 1, as amended.

Thus, the Applicants believe that all claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of all claims in the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

A. 35 USC §103 Claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38, and 42

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38, and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,774,045, issued August 10, 2004 to *Liu, et al.* (hereinafter *Liu*) in view of United States Patent 6,204,203, issued March 20, 2001 to *Narwankar, et al.* (hereinafter *Narwankar*). The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons presented in the prior office action response. However, to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 9, as indicated as allowable by the Examiner.

Thus, claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38 and 42 are patentable over *Liu* in view of *Narwankar*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

B. 35 USC §103 Claims 3, 11-12, 23, 35-37, and 39-41

Claims 3, 11-12, 23, 35-37, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liu* and *Narwankar* and as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38, and 42 and further in view of United States Patent 5,545,289, issued August 13, 1996 to *Chen, et al.* (hereinafter *Chen*). The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons presented in the prior office action response. However, to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 9, and claim 23 to incorporate the limitations of claim 31, as indicated as allowable by the Examiner.

Thus, claims 3, 11-12, 23, 35-37, and 39-41 are patentable over *Liu* and *Narwankar* as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38, and 42 and further in view of *Chen*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

C. 35 USC §103 Claim 25

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liu* and *Narwankar* and as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38, and 42 and further in view of United States Patent 6,133,102, issued October 17, 2000 to *Wu* (hereinafter *Wu*). The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons presented in the prior office action response. However, as noted above, independent claim 21, from which the above-rejected claim depends, has been amended into allowable form.

Thus, claim 25 is patentable over *Liu* and *Narwankar* and as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8, 17-19, 21-22, 26-30, 38, and 42 and further in view of *Wu*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both further consideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Alan Taboada at (732) 935-7100 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

December 12, 2007

/ Alan Taboada /

Alan Taboada, Esq.

Reg. No. 51,359

(732) 935-7100

Moser IP Law Group
1030 Broad Street, 2nd Floor
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702